

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES  
(Attorney Docket № 14973US02)**

In the Application of:

Marcus Kellerman, et al.

Serial № 10/674,672

Filed: September 30, 2003

For: SUPPORTING MULTIPLE USERS  
FROM A SINGLE LOCATION  
SHARING A MEDIA PROCESSING  
SYSTEM VIA A PERSONAL MEDIA  
GUIDE

Examiner: John R. Schnurr

Group Art Unit: 2623

Confirmation № 5006

**Electronically filed on 02-MAR-2009**

**APPEAL BRIEF**

Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This is an appeal from an Office Action dated September 30, 2008 (“Final Office Action”), in which claims 1-29 were finally rejected. The Appellant respectfully requests that the Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences (“Board”) reverses the final rejection of claims 1-29 of the present application. The Appellant notes that this Appeal Brief is timely filed within the period for reply that ends on March 2, 2009.

**REAL PARTY IN INTEREST**  
**(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(i))**

Broadcom Corporation, a corporation organized under the laws of the state of California, and having a place of business at 5300 California Avenue, Irvine, California 92617, has acquired the entire right, title and interest in and to the invention, the application, and any and all patents to be obtained therefor, as set forth in the Assignment recorded at Reel 014264, Frame 0574 in the PTO Assignment Search room.

**RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**  
**(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(ii))**

The Appellant is unaware of any related appeals or interferences.

**STATUS OF THE CLAIMS**  
**(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iii))**

Claims 1-29 were finally rejected. Pending claims 1-29 are the subject of this appeal.

The present application includes claims 1-29, which are pending in the present application. Claims 1-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0104099 ("Novak"). See the Final

Office Action at page 3. The Appellant identifies claims 1-29 as the claims that are being appealed. The text of the pending claims is provided in the Claims Appendix.

**STATUS OF AMENDMENTS**  
**(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(iv))**

The Appellant has not amended any claims subsequent to the final rejection of claims 1-29 mailed on September 30, 2008.

**SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER**  
**(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(v))**

The invention of claim 1 is illustratively described in the Specification of the present application in, for example, "Brief Summary of the Invention" section in pages 4-5, pages 8-14, and in Figures 1A-2. A system for supporting multiple users of a communication device may include a communication device (102) communicatively coupled to a communication network (108). See the present application at p. 4, lines 2-6; Figs. 1A-2. The media content may be disposed in the communication network or the communication device, and the media content may include broadcast media and personal media. See *id.* at p. 4, lines 7-9. A software platform may reside on the communication device (102), and the software platform may further receive authentication information associated with a user of the communication device, and facilitate a display of a user-defined selection from the media content by the

communication device in a user-defined layout (e.g., views 121-124 in Fig. 1B). *See id.* at p. 4, lines 9-12. The software platform is operable to communicate the media content to the communication network (108). *See* p. 10, line 25 – p. 11, line 6 (e.g., the described “push” functionality). The selection from the media content is defined by the user and corresponds to the received authentication information (e.g., first user password). *See* p. 10, line 10 – p. 13, line 7 (description of setting up personal or personalized view; personalized view of a TV channel guide user interface in response to a first user password); and Fig. 2.

Claims 2-11 are dependent upon claim 1.

The invention of claim 12 is illustratively described in the Specification of the present application in, for example, “Brief Summary of the Invention” section in pages 4-5, pages 8-14, and in Figures 1A-2. A system for supporting multiple users of a communication device may include at least one processor disposed in a communication device (102), the communication device being communicatively coupled to a communication network (108), the at least one processor receiving information related to a user-defined selection from media content available on one or both of the communication network and/or the communication device. *See* the present application at p. 4, lines 13-18; Fig. 1A. The at least one processor may receive authentication information associated with a user of the communication device and entered into the communication network via the communication device, and may analyze the authentication information to determine whether to display the user-defined selection on

the communication device. *See id.* at p. 4, lines 18-21. The selection from the media content is defined by the user and corresponds to the received authentication information (e.g., first user password). *See* p. 10, line 10 – p. 13, line 7 (description of setting up personal/personalized view; personalized view of a TV channel guide user interface in response to a first user password); and Fig. 2.

Claims 13-15 are dependent upon claim 12.

The invention of claim 16 is illustratively described in the Specification of the present application in, for example, “Brief Summary of the Invention” section in pages 4-5, pages 8-14, and in Figures 1A-2. A system for supporting multiple users of a communication device may include, for example, a first display, a second display, a communication network, media content, and a software platform. *See id.* at p. 4, lines 22-24. The first display may be communicatively coupled to a first communication device (e.g., a display coupled to MPS 102), and a second display may be communicatively coupled to a second communication device (e.g., a display coupled to MPS 106). *See id.* at p. 4, lines 24-26. A communication network (e.g., 108) may be communicatively coupled to the first communication device and the second communication device. *See id.* at p. 4, lines 26-27. The media content may be disposed in at least one of the communication network, the first communication device and the second communication device. *See id.* at p. 4, line 28 – p. 5, line 1. A software platform may reside on the first communication device (102), and the software platform may receive information relating to a user-defined selection from the media content, and

may authorizing the delivery of the user-defined selection to one or both of the first display and/or the second display. See *id.* at p. 5, lines 1-5. The user-defined selection may be delivered in a user-defined layout (e.g., views 121-124 in Fig. 1B). See *id.* at p. 5, lines 5-6. The selection from the media content may be defined by a user of the first communication device, and may correspond to authentication information received from the user (e.g., first user password). See p. 10, line 10 – p. 13, line 7 (description of setting up personal or personalized view; personalized view of a TV channel guide user interface in response to a first user password); and Fig. 2.

Claims 17-26 are dependent upon claim 16.

The invention of claim 27 is illustratively described in the Specification of the present application in, for example, “Brief Summary of the Invention” section in pages 4-5, pages 8-14, and in Figures 1A-2. A method to support multiple personalized views for users of a communication device may include entering a first set of authentication information via a communication device communicatively coupled to a communication network, the first set of authentication information associated with a first user of the communication device and corresponding to a first user-defined selection from media content (steps 201-203 in Fig. 2). See *id.* at p. 5, lines 7-11 and Fig. 2. The first user-defined selection may be displayed in a user-defined layout by the communication device upon validation of the first set of authentication information (step 203 in Fig. 2). See *id.* at p. 5, lines 11-13. The communication device may be reset so that a second set of authentication information may be entered on the communication device (step

204 in Fig. 2). See *id.* at p. 5, lines 13-15. The second set of authentication information may be entered via the communication device, the second set of authentication information associated with a second user of the communication device and corresponding to a second user-defined selection from media content (steps 205-206 in Fig. 2). See *id.* at p. 5, lines 15-17. The second user-defined selection may be displayed in a user-defined layout by the communication device upon validation of the second set of authentication information (step 206 in Fig. 2). See *id.* at p. 5, lines 17-19. The first selection may be defined by the first user, and the second selection may be defined by the second user. See p. 10, line 10 – p. 13, line 7 (description of setting up personal/personalized view; personalized view of a TV channel guide user interface in response to a first user password and a second user password); and Fig. 2.

Claims 28-29 are dependent upon claim 27.

**GROUND OF REJECTION TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL  
(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vi))**

Claims 1-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0104099 (“Novak”).

**ARGUMENT**  
**(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(vii))**

In the Final Office Action, claims 1-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0104099 (“Novak”).

**I. Novak Does Not Anticipate Claims 1-29**

The Appellant first turns to the rejection of claims 1-29 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Novak. With regard to the anticipation rejections under 102, MPEP 2131 states that “[a] claim is anticipated only if **each and every element** as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” See Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP) at 2131 (internal citation omitted). Furthermore, “[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” See *id.* (internal citation omitted).

Without conceding that Novak qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), the Appellant traverses the rejection as follows.

**A. Rejection of Independent Claims 1, 12, 16, and 27**

With regard to the rejection of independent claim 1 under 102(e), the Appellant submits that Novak does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of “the software platform receiving authentication information associated with a user of the communication device, and facilitating a display of a user-defined selection from the



media content by the communication device in a user-defined layout, wherein the software platform is operable to communicate the media content to the communication network, and wherein the selection from the media content is defined by the user and corresponds to the received authentication information,” as recited by the Appellant in independent claim 1. The Final Office Action states the following:

Consider claim 1, Novak clearly teaches a system for supporting multiple users of a communication device (Fig. 1), comprising:

a communication device communicatively coupled to a communication network; (Fig. 3: STB 308 is coupled to the Internet 302, [0045].)

media content disposed in the communication network or the communication device (Media content can be stored in the STB, Fig. 1 [0032], or on the network, Fig. 3 [0047].), the media content comprising broadcast media and personal media; (The content maybe broadcast, [0027, or user created, [0062].)

a software platform residing on the communication device ([0077]), the software platform receiving authentication information associated with a user of the communication device, (Fig. 11: Access to the synthetic channel can be password protected, [0084].) and facilitating a display of user-defined selection from the media content by the communication device (Fig. 11: Block 114, [0085]) in a user-defined layout (Fig. 7: The user defines the layout of the display, [0063].), wherein the software platform is operable to communicate the media content to the communication network, (Fig. 11: Media objects are uploaded to a server, [0078], the media source 122 is a STB, [0039].) and wherein the selection from the media content is defined by the user (The end user requests the media content, [0085].) and corresponds to the received authentication information. (Only authorized users can view the content, [0084])

See the Final Office Action at page 3. With regard to the software platform functionalities, the Final Office Action relies for support on FIGS. 7 and 11 of Novak. Initially, the Appellant points out that Novak discloses two distinct roles for users within

the media system of FIG. 1 – individuals who upload media and end users (e.g., users of STB 308 or 152). For example, certain individuals (e.g., upload source 122) can upload media objects to a server and specify a manner in which the media objects are to be played as a media program to an end user. The media program can be provided to an end user via a synthetic channel, which can be tuned to or selected by the end user as if tuning to a conventional television broadcast channel. See Novak at Abstract and ¶ 0010.

Novak, at FIGS. 5-7, discloses how **an upload source can organize/schedule the synthetic channel**. Novak, at FIG. 11, discloses how **an end user receives/views the synthetic channel**. In other words, **the synthetic channel is set up by the uploader, or the upload source, and it is only viewed by the end user, where the upload source 122 is different from the viewer (end user) of the EPG 153**. Steps 1104-1106 of FIG. 11 and the corresponding description in ¶ 0078 relate to the upload source 122, and **not** to the end-users (the Appellant notes the specific reference that uploaded media is broadcasted to the end users; See lines 10-11 of ¶ 0078). In this regard, **the platform used by the upload source 122 in steps 1104-1106 is not used by the end user STB 308**.

The Final Office Action is equating the password entered by the end user for protecting access to the synthetic channel (Novak at ¶ 0084) to Appellant's "authentication information associated with a user of the communication device," as recited in Appellant's claim 1. In other words, Novak's entered password is associated

with the end user viewing the EPG 153. **However, the end user does not have any control over what media is included in the media channel as such functionality is reserved for the uploader, or the upload source 122.** In this regard, Novak does not disclose “wherein the selection from the media content is defined by the user”, as recited in Appellant’s claim 1.

Furthermore, the Appellant points out that the Final Office Action equates Novak’s set-top box 308 (or 152) with Appellant’s “communication device.” However, **Novak does not disclose that the end user has the functionality of communicating (or forwarding/pushing) received media content back to the communication network.** Novak’s ¶0077-0078 relate to steps 1104-1106 of FIG. 11, which are performed by the upload source 122 and not by the end user. The fact that the upload source 122 may also utilize a STB for uploading is irrelevant since the Examiner has equated Appellant’s “communication device” to the STB 308. **Novak uses the upload source 122 exclusively for uploading content and there is no disclosure that “the software platform is operable to communicate the media content to the communication network,”** as recited in Appellant’s claim 1.

Accordingly, independent claim 1 is not anticipated by Novak and is allowable. Independent claims 12, 16, and 27 are similar in many respects to the method disclosed in independent claim 1 and have been rejected under the same rationale as claim 1. Therefore, the Appellant submits that independent claims 12, 16, and 27 are also

allowable over the reference cited in the Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1.

**B. Rejection of Dependent Claims 2 and 17**

Claims 2 and 17 depend on independent claims 1 and 12, respectively. Therefore, the Appellant submits that claims 2 and 17 are allowable over the reference cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1.

The Appellant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 2 and 17.

**C. Rejection of Dependent Claim 3**

Claim 3 depends on independent claim 1. Therefore, the Appellant submits that claim 3 is allowable over the reference cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1.

The Appellant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claim 3.

**D. Rejection of Dependent Claims 4, 15, and 19**

Claims 4, 15, and 19 depend on independent claims 1, 12, and 16, respectively. Therefore, the Appellant submits that claims 4, 15, and 19 are allowable over the reference cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1.

The Appellant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 4, 15, and 19.

**E. Rejection of Dependent Claims 5 and 20**

Claims 5 and 20 depend on independent claims 1 and 16, respectively. Therefore, the Appellant submits that claims 5 and 20 are allowable over the reference cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1.

The Appellant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 5 and 20.

**F. Rejection of Dependent Claims 6 and 21**

Claims 6 and 21 depend on independent claims 1 and 16, respectively. Therefore, the Appellant submits that claims 6 and 21 are allowable over the reference cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1.

The Appellant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 6 and 21.

**G. Rejection of Dependent Claims 7, 18, and 24**

Claims 7, 18, and 24 depend on independent claims 1 and 16, respectively. Therefore, the Appellant submits that claims 7, 18, and 24 are allowable over the reference cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1. The Appellant also submits that Novak does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of “the user-defined layout comprises a channel view layout,” as recited by the Appellant in claims 7, 18, and 24.

With regard to claim 7, the Final Office Action states the following at page 4:

Consider claim 7, Novak clearly teaches the user-defined layout comprises a channel view layout. (Fig. 8)

The Appellant points out that the Examiner has already equated the “user defined layout” to be Novak’s user interface 702 illustrated in Fig. 7 (not Fig. 8). Furthermore, as explained above, Fig. 7 relates to a layout that is defined by the uploader, **not** by the end user. Accordingly, the Appellant submits that claims 7, 18, and 24 are allowable over the reference cited in the Final Office Action at least for the above reasons.

The Appellant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 7, 18, and 24.

#### **H. Rejection of Dependent Claims 8 and 25**

Claims 8 and 25 depend on independent claims 1 and 16, respectively. Therefore, the Appellant submits that claims 8 and 25 are allowable over the reference cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1. The Appellant also submits that Novak does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of “the software platform can process a plurality of user-defined selections from the media content,” as recited by the Appellant in claims 8 and 25.

With regard to claim 8, the Final Office Action states the following at page 4:

Consider claim 8, Novak clearly teaches the software platform can process a plurality of user-defined selections from the media content. (The user selects media to view, [0085].)

The Examiner relies for support on paragraph 0085 (and Fig. 11) of Novak. As explained above, Fig. 11 relates to the upload source 122, and not to the end-users. In this regard, Novak at paragraph 0085 does not disclose any user-defined selections, since the selections have been made by the uploader. Accordingly, the Appellant submits that claims 8 and 25 are allowable over the reference cited in the Final Office Action at least for the above reasons.

The Appellant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 8 and 25.

## **I. Rejection of Dependent Claims 9 and 26**

Claims 9 and 26 depend on independent claims 1 and 16, respectively. Therefore, the Appellant submits that claims 9 and 26 are allowable over the reference cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1. The Appellant also submits that Novak does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of “each user-defined selection corresponds to a user-specific authentication information,” as recited by the Appellant in claims 9 and 26.

With regard to claim 9, the Final Office Action states the following at page 4:

Consider claim 9, Novak clearly teaches each user-defined selection corresponds to a user-specific authentication information. (Only authorized users may access the media content, [0084].)

The Examiner relies for support on paragraph 0084 (and Fig. 11) of Novak. As explained above, Fig. 11 relates to the upload source 122, and not to the end-users. In this regard, Novak at paragraph 0084 does not disclose any user-defined selections, since the selections have been made by the uploader. Accordingly, the Appellant submits that claims 9 and 26 are allowable over the reference cited in the Final Office Action at least for the above reasons.

The Appellant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 9 and 26.



**J. Rejection of Dependent Claim 10**

Claim 10 depends on independent claim 1. Therefore, the Appellant submits that claim 10 is allowable over the reference cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1.

The Appellant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claim 10.

**K. Rejection of Dependent Claims 11, 22, and 28**

Claims 11, 22, and 28 depend on independent claims 1, 16, and 27, respectively. Therefore, the Appellant submits that claims 11, 22, and 28 are allowable over the reference cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1. The Appellant also submits that Novak does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of “the software platform communicates the user-defined selection in the user-defined layout to the second communication device,” as recited by the Appellant in claims 11, 22, and 28.

With regard to claim 11, the Final Office Action states the following at page 4:

Consider claim 11, Novak clearly teaches a second communication device communicatively coupled to the communication network, wherein the software platform communicates the user-defined selection in the user-defined layout to the second communication device. (Fig. 11: A user uploads media objects organized into a synthetic channel to a server the server transfers the synthetic channel to a second communication device, [0077]-[0086].)

Novak, at FIG. 11, discloses how an end user receives/views the synthetic channel. In other words, the synthetic channel is set up by the uploader, or the upload source, and it is only viewed by the end user, where the upload source 122 is different from the viewer (end user) of the EPG 153. Steps 1104-1106 of FIG. 11 and the corresponding description in ¶ 0077-0086 relate to the upload source 122, and not to the end-users. Furthermore, the end-user does not have any control over what media is included in the media channel as such functionality is reserved for the uploader, or the upload source 122. In this regard, Novak, in FIG. 11, does not disclose any user-defined selection. Additionally, Novak does not disclose a second communication device, which receives the user-defined selection of media (the Appellant notes the Examiner has not clarified which device exactly is he considering to be the “second communication device”). Accordingly, the Appellant submits that claims 11, 22, and 28 are allowable over the reference cited in the Final Office Action at least for the above reasons.

The Appellant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 11, 22, and 28.

**L. Rejection of Dependent Claims 13, 23, and 29**

Claims 13, 23, and 29 depend on independent claims 12, 16, and 27, respectively. Therefore, the Appellant submits that claims 13, 23, and 29 are allowable over the reference cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above

with regard to claim 1. The Appellant also submits that Novak does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of “the at least one processor sends the user-defined selection to the communication device for display in a user-defined layout,” as recited by the Appellant in claims 13, 23, and 29.

With regard to claim 13, the Final Office Action states the following at page 5:

Consider claim 13, Novak clearly teaches the at least one processor sends the user-defined selection to the communication device for display in a user-defined layout. (Content is uploaded to a server in a user-defined layout, [0078].)

Novak, at FIG. 11, discloses how an end user receives/views the synthetic channel. In other words, the synthetic channel is set up by the uploader, or the upload source, and it is only viewed by the end user, where the upload source 122 is different from the viewer (end user) of the EPG 153. Steps 1104-1106 of FIG. 11 and the corresponding description in ¶ 0077-0086 relate to the upload source 122, and not to the end-users. Furthermore, the end-user does not have any control over what media is included in the media channel as such functionality is reserved for the uploader, or the upload source 122. In this regard, Novak, in FIG. 11, does not disclose any user-defined selection or user-defined layout. Accordingly, the Appellant submits that claims 13, 23, and 29 are allowable over the reference cited in the Final Office Action at least for the above reasons.

The Appellant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claims 13, 23, and 29.

**M. Rejection of Dependent Claim 14**

Claim 14 depends on independent claim 12. Therefore, the Appellant submits that claim 14 is allowable over the reference cited in the Final Office Action at least for the reasons stated above with regard to claim 1. The Appellant also submits that Novak does not disclose or suggest at least the limitation of “the at least one processor determines whether to send the user-defined selection to a second communication device communicatively coupled to the communication network,” as recited by the Appellant in claim 14.

With regard to claim 14, the Final Office Action states the following at page 5:

Consider claim 14, Novak clearly teaches the at least one processor determines whether to send the user-defined selection to a second communication device communicatively coupled to the communication network. (Subscribed end users receive the EPG 153, [0080].)

Novak, at FIG. 11, discloses how an end user receives/views the synthetic channel. In other words, the synthetic channel is set up by the uploader, or the upload source, and it is only viewed by the end user, where the upload source 122 is different from the viewer (end user) of the EPG 153. Steps 1104-1106 of FIG. 11 and the corresponding description in ¶ 0077-0086 relate to the upload source 122, and not to the end-users. Furthermore, the end-user does not have any control over what media is included in the media channel as such functionality is reserved for the uploader, or the upload source 122. In this regard, Novak, in FIG. 11, does not disclose any user-defined selection or user-defined layout. Accordingly, the Appellant submits that claim

14 is allowable over the reference cited in the Final Office Action at least for the above reasons.

The Appellant also reserves the right to argue additional reasons beyond those set forth above to support the allowability of claim 14.

### **CONCLUSION**

For at least the foregoing reasons, the Appellant submits that claims 1-29 are in condition for allowance. Reversal of the Examiner's rejection and issuance of a patent on the application are therefore requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge \$540 (to cover the Brief on Appeal Fee) and any additional fees or credit any overpayment to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd., Account No. 13-0017.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 02-MAR-2009

By: /Ognyan I. Beremski/  
Ognyan Beremski, Reg. No. 51,458  
Attorney for Appellant

McANDREWS, HELD & MALLOY, LTD.  
500 West Madison Street, 34th Floor  
Chicago, Illinois 60661  
Telephone: (312) 775-8000  
Facsimile: (312) 775 – 8100

(OIB)

**CLAIMS APPENDIX**  
**(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(viii))**

1. A system for supporting multiple users of a communication device, comprising:

a communication device communicatively coupled to a communication network;  
media content disposed in the communication network or the communication device, the media content comprising broadcast media and personal media; and

a software platform residing on the communication device, the software platform receiving authentication information associated with a user of the communication device, and facilitating a display of a user-defined selection from the media content by the communication device in a user-defined layout, wherein the software platform is operable to communicate the media content to the communication network, and wherein the selection from the media content is defined by the user and corresponds to the received authentication information.

2. The system according to claim 1, wherein the communication network comprises one or more of a third party media server, a media storage server, a broadband access headend, a cable infrastructure, a satellite network infrastructure, a digital subscriber line (DSL) infrastructure, an Internet infrastructure, an intranet infrastructure, a wired infrastructure, a closed communication infrastructure, a local area network, and/or a wireless infrastructure.

3. The system according to claim 1, wherein the communication network comprises the Internet.

4. The system according to claim 1, wherein the communication device comprises one or more of a computer, a storage device, a media peripheral, set-top box circuitry, a television, a display, and/or a remote control.

5. The system according to claim 1, wherein the media content comprises one or more of third party media content, user-created media content, digital video, digital images, digital audio, documents, files, broadcast television programs, radio channels, news programming, sporting events programming, special programming, and/or on-demand movies.

6. The system according to claim 1, wherein the software platform performs on the media content one or more of accessing, sending, constructing the user-defined layout of the media content, displaying, text overlaying, voice overlaying, channel naming, managing authorship rights, managing media rights, managing billing services, and/or integrating the user-defined selection into the user-defined layout.

7. The system according to claim 1, wherein the user-defined layout comprises a channel view layout.



8. The system according to claim 1, wherein the software platform can process a plurality of user-defined selections from the media content.

9. The system according to claim 8, wherein each user-defined selection corresponds to a user-specific authentication information.

10. The system according to claim 1, wherein the authentication information comprises one or more of a pin code, a voice key code, and/or a password.

11. The system according to claim 1, comprising:  
a second communication device communicatively coupled to the communication network,  
wherein the software platform communicates the user-defined selection in the user-defined layout to the second communication device.

12. A system for supporting multiple users of a communication device, comprising:

at least one processor disposed in a communication device, the communication device being communicatively coupled to a communication network, the at least one processor receiving information related to a user-defined selection from media content available on one or both of the communication network and/or the communication device, the at least one processor receiving authentication information associated with a

user of the communication device and entered into the communication network via the communication device, and analyzing the authentication information to determine whether to display the user-defined selection on the communication device, and wherein the selection from the media content is defined by the user and corresponds to the received authentication information.

13. The system according to claim 12, wherein the at least one processor sends the user-defined selection to the communication device for display in a user-defined layout.

14. The system according to claim 13, wherein the at least one processor determines whether to send the user-defined selection to a second communication device communicatively coupled to the communication network.

15. The system according to claim 12, wherein the at least one processor is one or more of a computer processor, a media peripheral processor, a set-top box processor, a media exchange system processor, a media processing system processor, and/or a storage processor.

16. A system for supporting multiple users of a communication device, comprising:

a first display communicatively coupled to a first communication device;

a second display communicatively coupled to a second communication device;

a communication network communicatively coupled to the first communication device and the second communication device;

media content disposed in at least one of the communication network, the first communication device and the second communication device; and

a software platform residing on the first communication device, the software platform receiving information relating to a user-defined selection from the media content and authorizing the delivery of the user-defined selection to one or both of the first display and/or the second display, the user-defined selection being delivered in a user-defined layout, and wherein the selection from the media content is defined by a user of the first communication device and corresponds to authentication information received from the user.

17. The system according to claim 16, wherein the communication network comprises one or more of a third party media server, a media storage server, a broadband access headend, a cable infrastructure, a satellite network infrastructure, a digital subscriber line (DSL) infrastructure, an Internet infrastructure, an intranet infrastructure, a wired infrastructure, a closed communication infrastructure, a local area network, and/or a wireless infrastructure.

18. The system according to claim 16, wherein the user-defined layout comprises a channel view layout.

19. The system according to claim 16, wherein at least one of the first communication device and the second communication device comprise one or more of a computer, a storage device, a media peripheral, set-top box circuitry, a television, a display, and/or a remote control.

20. The system according to claim 16, wherein the media content comprises one or more of third party media content, user-created media content, digital video, digital images, digital audio, documents, files, broadcast television programs, radio channels, news programming, sporting events programming, special programming, and/or on-demand movies.

21. The system according to claim 16, wherein the software platform performs on the media content one or more of accessing, sending, constructing a user-defined layout of the media content, displaying, text overlaying, voice overlaying, channel naming, managing authorship rights, managing media rights, managing billing services, and/or integrating the user-defined selection into a user-defined layout.

22. The system according to claim 16, wherein the software platform sends the user-defined selection to the second display.

23. The system according to claim 22, wherein the sent user-defined selection is displayed in a user-defined layout.

24. The system according to claim 23, wherein the user-defined layout comprises a channel view layout.

25. The system according to claim 16, wherein the software platform can process a plurality of user-defined selections.

26. The system according to claim 25, wherein each user-defined selection corresponds to a user-specific authentication information.

27. A method to support multiple personalized views for users of a communication device, comprising:

entering a first set of authentication information via a communication device communicatively coupled to a communication network, the first set of authentication information associated with a first user of the communication device and corresponding to a first user-defined selection from media content.

displaying the first user-defined selection in a user-defined layout by the communication device upon validation of the first set of authentication information;

resetting the communication device so that a second set of authentication information may be entered on the communication device;

entering the second set of authentication information via the communication device, the second set of authentication information associated with a second user of the communication device and corresponding to a second user-defined selection from media content; and

displaying the second user-defined selection in a user-defined layout by the communication device upon validation of the second set of authentication information, and wherein the first selection is defined by the first user and the second selection is defined by the second user.

28. The method according to claim 27, comprising:

sending the user-defined selection to a second communication device communicatively coupled to the communication network.

29. The method according to claim 28, comprising:

displaying the user-defined selection in a user-defined layout on the second communication device.

**EVIDENCE APPENDIX**  
**(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(ix))**

- (1) United States Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0104099 ("Novak"), entered into record by the Examiner in the March 18, 2008 Office Action.

**RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX**  
**(37 C.F.R. § 41.37(c)(1)(x))**

The Appellant is unaware of any related appeals or interferences.